

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1971

April 26, 1971

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "April 26, 1971" (1971). *Minutes*. 462.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/462

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

E A S T E R N I L L I N O I S U N I V E R S I T Y
FACULTY SENATE
Proceedings of April 26, 1971

MEMBERS PRESENT: Katsimpalis, Shuff, Trank, Lenihan, Whitlow, Downs,
 Funk, Owens, Whalin, Nichols, Rawls, Foreman, Barford,
 Kluge

MEMBERS ABSENT: Elliott

Student Observers Present: Grosboll, Greene, Marks, Birchler

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Roger Whitlow.
A motion was made by Downs, seconded by Barford, to thank
Mr. Whalin for his past work as secretary. The motion passed
unanimously.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Whitlow reported that the Executive Committee had set their
regular meeting time for 9:00 a.m. each Friday. It was the con-
sensus of the Senate to hold the next meeting on Tuesday, May 4th
from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. because the meeting room was not available
on Monday. It was also agreed that the Faculty Senate would not
meet on May 24th, the first day of examinations.

It was the consensus of the Senate that Mr. Whitlow send a letter
of welcome to Dr. Gilbert C. Fite, President-Elect of Eastern Illinois
University. As part of his Executive Committee Report, Mr. Whitlow
presented the Senate with a listing of committees which are as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEES

<u>Budget and Finance</u>	<u>Nominations</u>	<u>Calendar</u>
Whalin, Chairman	Read, Chairman	Downs, Chairman
Shuff	Downs	Hattabaugh
Kluge	Trank	Owens
<u>Buildings and Grounds</u>	<u>Elections</u>	<u>Student-Faculty Relations</u>
Elliott, Chairman	Smith, Chairman	
Hattabaugh	Shuff	Barford, Chairman
Katsimpalis	Downs	Foreman
	Owens	Whalin
<u>Council of Instructional Officers</u>		<u>Parliamentarian</u>
Lenihan		
Trank (alternate)		Smith

The proposed agenda was also discussed with suggested changes of
items 4 and 7 to head the list for discussion purposes.

A motion was made by Downs, seconded by Lenihan, to go into execu-
tive session regarding a personnel matter.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Council Of Instructional Officers

Lenihan indicated that President Doudna had approved a draft on teaching loads for faculty, and a proposed bank to accumulate to 24 thesis hours or 40 hours of Independent Study. At this time, the faculty member would be entitled to a course reduction in load. No report was given on the Council of University Planning.

Nominations Committee

The Nominations Committee reported on a proposed Athletic Commission and a request by Jack Marks, Student Body President, for a faculty representation. This commission would study the future of athletics at Eastern Illinois University. Lenihan moved and Rawls seconded the motion that the Senate should appoint two faculty to represent "neutrality" on the Commission. The motion lost 7 to 5.

COMMUNICATIONS:

It was moved by Barford and seconded by Kluge that Vice President Holt be requested to include the members of the Budget Committee on all correspondence concerning the internal budget for 1971-72. The motion was carried 11 yes and 2 no.

A. The following communication from Vice President Holt:

TO: Budget Committee DATE: April 22, 1971
SUBJECT: 1971-72 Internal Budget

As of the present date, we have little new to report to you regarding our operating budget for 1971-72. Our budget was reduced by our Board and the Higher Board, and Governor Ogilvie has called for a further rather drastic reduction in all university budgets.

It is quite apparent that higher education is in trouble and that there will be further cuts before we get an approved budget. It is also likely that we will not get this approved budget until near the very end of present FY 70-71.

The Budget Officer has returned the internal budgets to the respective vice presidents and has indicated the cuts needed to get us within the funds available by line item. Because the funds available figures are certain to be less than that furnished by the Budget Officer not much can be done in the way of reducing the internal budgets until we know how much actually will be available to us. Were we to proceed to reduce internal budgets now on the basis of figures available, we would have to do this again when correct figures become available. For this reason, we have not called any meetings of the Budget Committee recently. We do not want to waste your time until we have something definite to discuss.

It is very apparent from the freeze that it has been necessary to impose on Equipment and Commodities just recently that we did not do a good job of budgeting for FY 1970-71. Insufficient funds were provided for utilities, for telephone expense and for postage. At the time that

internal budgets were approved last year it was apparent that a minimal amount was being provided in these areas, but in order to have as much as possible available for the various departments, we proceeded and planned to make transfers later in the year if utility funds proved inadequate.

It is essential that we not plan to handle in this manner again. It just is not possible to equitably transfer funds once current year operations are under way and internal budgets have been approved. It is essential that adequate funds be provided in the approved internal budgets for utilities, postage, telephones, etc. Because our telephone expense and postage expense have increased greatly, we should consider looking closely at these areas at the time that internal budgets are established for FY 71-72 to determine whether or not reductions in cost will have to be made.

Unless any of the Budget Committee members have items that require immediate attention, we will not schedule a meeting of the committee until we have definite information regarding approved appropriations.

B. Two sets of minutes were received from the Student Senate.

C. The following communications from President Doudna:

TO: Mr. Whitlow, Chairman
Faculty Senate

DATE: April 21, 1971

I am enclosing a copy of a memorandum dated February 9th to Dr. Tingley. As far as I know, this matter has not gotten on the agenda of the Faculty Senate, although I may be wrong. There is no real hurry about it, but I thought some start ought to be made and am not sure that it has been. Since considerable debate will probably develop on the issue, I simply want to be sure that the matter is not being neglected.

Quincy Doudna
President

TO: Dr. Tingley

DATE: February 9, 1971

In the past, I have given priority in my consideration of the requests for sabbatical leaves to persons who were studying to upgrade their qualifications, particularly to those who were working on doctorates. I adopted this kind of priority as a policy as early as 1957, if I remember correctly. I discussed it with the Personnel Committee at that time and in subsequent years and we never reached a conclusion that the policy ought to be changed.

On the other hand, I should point out that the policy was for most years somewhat irrelevant in that we were usually able to recommend leaves to the Board of Governors for nearly all eligible applicants and in some years all were accommodated either initially or after some of the earlier grantees withdrew.

This year we found an unusual situation in which, in spite of the liberalized quota for sabbatical leaves, a great many eligible applicants had to be denied. Thus, the matter of priorities becomes important and should be considered as a policy matter. While I think the policy I have used is defensible in terms of the good of the university and the good of the staff, I recognize that it is debatable. I, therefore, recommend that the Faculty Senate give policy consideration to this matter at some appropriate time between now and December 15, 1971, the deadline for the next applications which will be received. If you accept my recommendation, you may wish to start on this during the current year but I request that no final report be issued until it can have the consideration of my successor. I do not plan to take any action on the question of a possible change.

It is important that the view of the members of the Council of Instructional Officers be sought on this rather large policy question. I request that you use appropriate means to determine whether those views should be sought through consultation or through joint membership on any ad hoc committee that may be established. I suggest that Vice President Moody be consulted for a recommendation on procedures for joint consideration.

cc: Vice President Moody Quincy Doudna
Dr. Moler President

D. The following communication from Dr. Schlauch:

TO: Dr. Roger Whitlow, Chairman DATE: April 23, 1971
Faculty Senate

The Department of History has approved of the current resolution (Nichols) before the Faculty Senate detailing faculty obligations and rights to be included in the Faculty Manual. The history department further suggests that the guidelines prepared by Vice President Moody be distributed for information purposes to the university departments by the Deans at the beginning of the fall quarter.

E. The following communication from Dr. Kluge:

TO: Faculty Senate DATE: April 21, 1971

SUBJECT: Summary Minutes of University
Retirement System dated January 20,
1971.

1. Attached to the minutes were copies of three letters regarding resolutions of the University of Illinois Senates Conference and the subsequent recommendations of President Henry and the Board of Trustees. The second paragraph of the letter to the Members of the Board of Higher Education presents a summary of the three letters. It is as follows:

"In the transmission of these documents, the Trustees would have me convey to you their support of the objectives stated therein; i.e., (1) the necessity for fully funding the State Universities Retirement System, and (2) the importance of providing adequately for salary increases, in particular in reference to the Master Plan recommendation, viz.: 'Salaries and perquisites of faculty members at the several state-supported colleges and universities be kept high enough to compete for staff with other institutions having educational, service, and research programs of similar breadth, level, and quality.'"

2. A report on "Financing of the State Universities Retirement System" written by Edward Gibala the Executive Director, points out the following:

- a. The Actuary of the Retirement System certified an appropriation of 14.82 percent of personal services would be required during FY 71 to meet the statutory requirement. The BHE arbitrarily reduced this to 5.2 percent and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget refused to adjust the amount to that required by statute.
- b. The amount lost to the System during the past four years is more than \$106 million - Future taxpayers will not only have to make up the \$106 million, but also the interest on that amount. At a rate of 6% (present yield is about 8%) this could cost the taxpayers in the year 2000, approximately \$600 million.
- c. At the end of 1968-69 the unfunded accrued liabilities amounted to 1 billion 205 million dollars for services already rendered. The following table presents factual information for the five State Systems:

	Accrued <u>Liabilities</u>	Net Present <u>Assets</u>	Unfunded Accrued <u>Liabilities</u>	Rate of <u>Funding</u>
State Universities	\$ 372,640,877	\$178,648,043	\$193,922,834	47.9%
State Teachers'	1,255,900,000	533,900,000	722,000,000	42.5
State Employees'	503,132,140	233,552,121	269,580,019	46.4
Judges	27,850,745	9,652,384	18,198,361	34.7
Gen. Assembly	<u>7,247,274</u>	<u>5,161,010</u>	<u>2,086,264</u>	<u>71.2</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$2,166,771,036</u>	<u>960,913,558</u>	<u>1,205,857,478</u>	<u>42.5%</u>

e. Mr. Gibala concludes his report by the following:

"The repeated cuts in the appropriations for retirement contributions which have been made despite the statutory requirement for full funding, can only lead to undesirable results for the members of the State Universities Retirement System and the State universities and colleges. The cuts are undermining the confidence of the members in the ability of the Retirement System

to meet future commitments. This is defeating the major purpose for which the System was established."

"Current State administrators and legislators are shifting the burden of current pension obligations to future State administrators and legislators. Will the future administrators, legislators, and taxpayers of Illinois accept an employer contribution rate of perhaps 25 to 30 percent of salary costs when the going contribution rate to fully funded college plans of other states may be 10 percent or less? Isn't it likely that the future legislators, who are faced with raising revenue to operate State government, will lower the benefit schedule or demand a higher rate of contributions by the members?"

"The member contribution rates in the State of Illinois are currently among the highest in the United States for public employees. Isn't it conceivable that the past failure of the State to meet its financial commitments to the System and the resulting interest loss during the recent period of historically high interest rates, are primarily responsible for the relatively high current member contribution rate in this State?"

"The members have a right to expect more than a mere promise by current administrators and legislators that future administrators and legislators can and will make up the deficiencies. The State should appropriate its fair share of the pension costs as the service to the State is rendered. The employer contribution is essentially a part of salary which is earned by the member, and this contribution should be financed by the State in the same manner. Practically all other colleges and university pension plans in the United States are financed on this basis, and there is no valid reason why the plan covering the State of Illinois colleges and universities should continue to show an annual deficit in the employer contributions of more than \$25 million."

3. The minutes of the meeting of January 20, 1971, revealed the following:
 - a. The completion of the new office building was delayed until April 1st. Heating elements were authorized for the length of the front walk because it would be used by disabled and retired members.
 - b. A change in the definition of final average salary from 5 to 4 consecutive years was made by the Pension Laws Commission and will be incorporated into the 1971 Legislative Program by the Retirement Board.

Donald A. Kluge
Dean, Student Housing

A motion was made by Downs and seconded by Barford to place the two major items in the report on the agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

F. The following communication from P. Scott Smith:

TO: Faculty Senate

DATE: April 26, 1971

Statement Concerning The Appointment
of an Assistant Dean of Letters And
Science

The Personnel Committee feels compelled to object to the procedures used in selecting an assistant to Dean Ringenberg. The Committee took the position that, with economic austerity measures being forced on the state universities, no new assistant deanships should be appointed at this time. Where the work load is truly oppressive, it was the Committee's judgment that the employment of highly qualified secretarial help or an executive assistant might be indicated.

While some may view the matter of title to the position unimportant, the Personnel Committee does not subscribe to this view. We feel that there is a very important distinction to be made between the title of Assistant Dean and anything less specific (such as "Assistant to the Dean" or "Executive Assistant assigned to the Dean's Office.") Logically, an Assistant Dean acts with the full powers of the Dean in the absence of the latter. Thus he should possess all of the qualifications to become Dean should the incumbent resign or retire. Furthermore, an Assistant Dean should be expected to have duties far transcending the responsibilities of an executive assistant. The Personnel Committee learned only after the appointment had been made that, in spite of its objections, the appointee was designated "Assistant Dean."

Notwithstanding its reservations concerning the wisdom of creating any new administrative positions, the Personnel Committee made clear its view that in the event an Assistant Dean of Letters and Science were to be selected, his choice should be determined by a search committee representative of diverse segments of the Letters & Science College, allowing for input particularly at the interview stage from all department heads from within the college. From its limited knowledge of what actually transpired, the Personnel Committee is left with the strong impression that the "search" as actually conducted was superficial, with the choice determined in advance.

Since Dean Ringenberg, in raising the question of the areas from which the choice might most favorably be made, ruled out mathematics and the physical sciences, it appears inconsistent not to allow others to consider the matter of area suitability. We do not misrepresent the college when we state that this matter was and is of considerable concern to many Letters & Science faculty members.

In the view of the Personnel Committee the whole matter was conducted disingenuously, whether intentionally or not, and without sufficient consultation, particularly with significant parts of the faculty within the Letters & Science College.

We wish to make it clear to everyone that this critique is in no wise to be construed as questioning the personal qualities or qualifications of the person selected as Assistant Dean. We have high personal

regard for Dr. Hadwiger and regret that his position has been made unnecessarily difficult by the manner of his selection.

P. Scott Smith, Chairman
Personnel Committee

cc: President Doudna
L. Wood
C. Switzer

It was moved by Lenihan and seconded by Rawls that this topic be placed on the agenda for a future meeting. The motion was passed 11 yes, 2 abstentions.

OLD BUSINESS

It was moved by Lenihan and seconded by Downs to defer any discussion of the draft letter on Master Plan Phase III because of the recent second draft of the third phase of the Master Plan. The motion carried 12 yes, 1 abstention.

A discussion ensued regarding the Apportionment Board proposal to amend Appendix A., Organization of Student Faculty Apportionment Board, Bylaws and Operating Procedures Student Faculty Apportionment Board: The major change in the composition of the Student-Faculty Apportionment Board would be to reduce the present three faculty members to 4 ex-officio members, as indicated in the proceedings of April 19, 1971. It was moved by Lenihan and seconded by Rawls to approve the motion to amend Appendix A. as requested by the Student Senate. The motion lost with 6 yes, 5 no, 2 abstentions.

Mr. Whitlow appointed a Distinguished Faculty Award Committee consisting of Shuff, Chairman, Whalin and Lenihan. They were assigned three specific tasks as follows:

1. To find out whether Johnson Company will fund the award for 71-72.
2. If it is not funded could it be granted as an honorary award.
3. Is it possible to use Faculty receipts from the vending machine for this particular purpose?

The topic of "Professional Duties" as presented by Vice President Moody and contained in the Faculty Senate proceedings of April 12, 1971, were discussed by the Senate. Kluge moved and Downs seconded a motion to accept the recommendation of the History Department which is contained in the above memo from Dr. Schlauch. Mr. Barford offered a substitute motion as follows: "Include Vice President Moody's statement as 'Institutional Rules in the Faculty Manual' and not to publish the AAUP Collection of statements. After some

discussion, Kluge moved the question, which was seconded by Downs, the motion carried 7 yes, 5 no. The vote on the substitute motion lost 7 yes, 4 no, and 2 abstentions. Mr. Lenihan moved and Mr. Rawls seconded an amendment to the motion to strike section B from the original document. Mr. Nichols moved the question which was seconded by Downs. The motion carried 7 yes, 3 no. Mr. Lenihan then moved to adjourn. The motion to adjourn was defeated 5 yes, 4 no. A vote was then taken on the amendment to strike section B from the original document. The motion was defeated with 5 yes, 6 no, and one abstention. A vote was taken on the main motion to accept the recommendation of the History Department. The motion was defeated 5 yes, 6 no, and 1 abstention. Motion was made to adjourn which passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

The next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on Tuesday, May 4th from 2:00 pm to 4:00 p.m. in the Heritage Room of the University Union, as the meeting room will not be available on Monday.

AGENDA:

1. Professional Duties
2. Personnel Matters
3. Master Plan Phase III
4. Apportionment Board Reorganization
5. Distinguished Faculty Award
6. Constitutional Amendments
7. Senate Constitution By-Laws
8. Classroom Visitation
9. Registration
10. Enrollment Policy for Faculty

Donald A. Kluge
Secretary, pro tem